DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 318 377 HE 023 472

AUTHOR	Adelman, Clifford
TITLE	Cultural Literacies in the College Curriculum: The Records of a Generation.
INSTITUTION	Department of Education, Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	89
NOTE	32p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Viewpoints (120)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Cross Cultural Studies; *Cultural Awareness; *Cultural Education; Curriculum; *Diffusion (Communication); Higher Education; Program Content; *Role of Education; Student Characteristics
IDENTIFIERS	National Longitudinal Study High School Class 1972

ABSTRACT

The paper explores the role of higher education in the diffusion of cultural information. The paper analyzes the postsecondary curricular experience using data from the National Longitudinal Study for the Class of 1972 (NLS/72). Four stores of information are identified as the "primary" cultural store and secondary stores corresponding to demographic, cultural-interest, and specialist subgroups and these streams of information are represented by course clusters in: (1) minority and women's studies, (2) popular culture/media, (3) non-western culture and society, and (4) western culture and society. The paper also examines the nature of the institutions in which formal cultural studies are pursued and the demography of students who tend to engage in formal study in one or more of the cultural literacy clusters. Findings show that one out of five Bachelor's degree recipients in the NLS/72 had no postsecondary exposure to western cultural/social information at all. The lowest participation rates occurred among majors in engineering and applied sciences. Given the NLS/72 generation's limited exposure to its own culture and its even more limited exposure to secondary cultural literacies, it is concluded that this generation seems unsuited to participate in the diversity of world culture and economy. Includes 22 references. (JDD)

CULTURAL LITERACIES IN THE COLLEGE CURRICULUM: the Records of a Generation*

Clifford Adelman, Senior Associate
Office of Research, U.S. Department of Education

Cultural Literacy: a Diffusion Question

CULTURAL LITERACIES IN THE COLLEGE CURRICULUM: the Records of a Generation*

Clifford Adelman, Senior Associate
Office of Research, U.S. Department of Education

Cultural Literacy: a Diffusion Question

"Education and culture are not yet on speaking terms in our country," wrote Frank Lloyd Wright in The Living City. A lifelong curmudgeon, Wright had a knack for encapsulating social criticism in a sentence, and for offering what appear to be flippant observations that have nonetheless stood the test of time.

The current debates about what students should know of various aspects of our culture, and about how that knowledge should be provided, can be enlightened considerably by the records of the Class of '72. Those records will show that, on the surface, Wright is still right: if we define "culture" in the paradigmatic terms of the humanities disciplines, narrowly construed, that "culture" isn't getting too far through formal educational channels. Even if the definition of "culture" is cast in terms that admit of history and its materials, other social sciences, and the performing arts, the pattern of diffusion of knowledge is but slightly more encouraging.

To set the paths and parameters straight and clear at the outset, my purpose in this paper is to use the NLS/PETS data to explore the role of higher education in the diffusion of cultural information to a generation. This is a somewhat different approach to the debates occasioned by E.D. Hirsch's Cultural Literacy (1987) and its widely publicized list of terms that "literate Americans [should] know." Hirsch's work is grounded in serious scholarship concerning how we learn to read, how national languages are formed, sustained, and changed, how the cultures of six continents ensure their continuity by transmitting stocks of information to their young, and in empirical research demonstrating that "part of language skill is content skill." (Hirsch, 1983) Whether one agrees with the way Hirsch treated some of his sources (Scholes, 1987; Sledd and Sledd, 1988), whether, as I believe, he overlooked other sources in the history of national language planning that might have bolstered parts of his presentation, is beside the framework of this piece.

What is relevant to the framework of this piece, though, is the common perception of Hirsch's "list" as an attempt to standardize the basic elements of the shorthand we use to communicate, hence

---

* An earlier version of this paper was presented at the 1989 Convention of the Modern Language Association of America.

what should be utilized in school and college instruction. A sociolinguist (e.g. Ferguson, 1968) might use the analogy of the process by which any language community comes to accept one form of language as a "supradialectical norm." Where there are minority language cultures requiring "authentification" and a mainstream culture that requires unification and efficiency through a common language, as Joshua Fishman (1971) points out, the latter has historically taken precedence in every nation where the situation existed. Educational critics of Hirsch are very blunt about this issue, though ignorant of its sociolinguistic grounds: they describes Hirsch's goal as promoting "the nationalization of knowledge" (Ross, 1989) or "American facts" (Kohl, 1989).

What the critics overlook are the many ways in which the entire industry of higher education in the United States (let alone other countries) already diffuses cultural information, and, in effect, "nationalizes knowledge" (indeed, "internationalizes" knowledge). In Invisible Colleges (1972), Diana Crane argued rather convincingly that the social system of the academic disciplines functions to produce and disseminate consensus on learning, though, as Anthony Becher has recently demonstrated, the extent of that dissemination varies widely by the dominant mode of academic work in a field (Becher, 1989). Even so, through professional and learned societies and their journals and pamphlets, the knowledge worth having is often expounded to the general public (Todorov, 1989). A. Hunter Dupree called these organizations "information systems" with the normative function of expressing values concerning the creation and flow of knowledge (Dupree, 1976).

There is a distinction between what Martin Mueller (1989) calls "the scholarly and the pedagogical canon," that is, the range of accepted topics or problems studied by professors in their research and the range of materials and treatments they use in instruction, the range of course topics reflected in the archives of generations passing through college. The distinction emerged in the course of discussions on the evolution and sociology of the disciplines following Kuhn's (1960) introduction of the concepts of knowledge paradigm and disciplinary consensus. What happens, as Gerald Holton (1962) pointed out, is that just at the moment when the scholarly work is exhausted, the materials and topics are established enough to make their way into the college classroom and the pedagogical canon. It may very well be that the scholarship of the 1970s and early 1980s on some of the "secondary" sources of cultural literacy had not matured enough to be part of the curricular experience of the Class of '72, but we won't know that for sure until we see the ten-year college transcript sample of the Class of '82.

In colleges themselves, the dissemination of cultural information takes place through public television programming, through student activities such as drama, film festivals, literary magazines, through special colloquia and conferences, through "unofficial" courses and discussion groups, and so forth. None of these involve formal course-taking. Attendance and participation do not generate any records. College students can, in fact, learn a great deal about history, the arts, and literature on their own. Of course, the larger and more complex the institution they attend, the greater the range of potential cultural exposure. But it's hard to complete a communicative response to a popular song, such as Billy Joel's "We Didn't Start the Fire" (the lyrics of which cover a half-century of history via a Hirsch-like list), without more effort than many students are willing to make, in or out of class (Adelman, 1972).

We usually measure and discuss these matters in the lives of college students with respect to the formal curriculum. What we can learn from the NLS/72 database--more than anywhere else--is who studies how much of what and where with respect to various classes of cultural information. If we accept Hirsch's notion of "cultural literacy" as the ability to use a store of referential language that empowers us to communicate efficiently, the question of where that language--or languages--is diffused is a critical one. Education, in general, functions principally to expand the language space of individuals, and through that expansion, to enable those individuals to participate more fully in our society, culture, and economy. This addendum to Hirsch's thesis of cultural literacy as "empowerment" derives from Franz Machlup's (1980) seminal work on knowledge production--which, as Machlup notes, includes all forms of "disclosure, dissemination, transmission, and communication," as well as "discovering, inventing, designing, and planning." (pp. 7-8)

While Machlup uses the terms synonymously, knowledge is of a higher order than mere information. As Wayne Booth (1988) has pointed out, even in cultures (cited by Hirsch) that require their children to memorize large bodies of material, what is disseminated is more than a list, more than information, more than what Machlup terms "disconnected events or facts." The children are immersed in a stream of stories and sagas and oral editorials and discoveries, all of which convey the touchstones, totems, and values of the societies into which they will grow. In short, there is context for the content, and without that context, there is no motivation to become engaged, to search further, to question. We know that knowledge is diffused--as opposed to disseminated--in our society when people can recognize, use, and act upon innovations, that is, departures from existing patterns of experience. The recognition, use, and action depend upon more than mere information, but without the

information, the recognition of what is a departure, what is change, is itself problematic.

Common sense empiricism suggests that the chances one will expand any part of one's language space are higher if one successfully completes, that is, immerses oneself in, formal courses in subjects that embrace those spaces, and, in the process, draws on stocks or stores of discrete information. I assume, too--perhaps naively--that such formal courses also increase the chances that one will transform that information into knowledge, develop critical interests, search further, question.

Four Cultural Literacies

While there may be a "primary" store of referential language that allows for hueristics in mass communication, there are secondary stores that allow demographic, cultural-interest, and specialist sub-groups to communicate in similar ways. Thus, in presenting the postsecondary curricular experience of the Class of 1972, I am using four illustrative stores of information: the "primary" cultural language as described by Hirsch, and secondary stores of language corresponding to demographic, cultural-interest, and specialist sub-groups. I propose that these four "cultural languages" are not mutually exclusive in essence, rather competing in the finite time of undergraduate education. More of X always means less of Y when the full glass measures 120 credits, and when credits are proxies for time.

The four streams of information in the NLS/72 archive are represented by course clusters in: (1) minority and women's studies (a cluster defined by demographic categories); (2) popular culture/media (a cluster defined by cultural interest); (3) non-western culture and society (a cluster defined by academic specialist interests); and (4) western culture and society.

The content of these clusters was empirically derived from the combination of literal course titles, a priori decision rules, and our revised taxonomy of the Classification of Instructional Programs as described in the introduction to this volume. In two of these clusters, the revised taxonomy may skew the estimates of participation. One of these is "women's studies," which had its own code as an interdisciplinary field. The decision rule governing assignment of titles was that, beyond the obvious, all titles referring to gender that could not be classified in other categories within specific disciplines were classified as Women's Studies. In other words, the category was a repository for generalized titles. Thus, for example, a course such as "The Image of Women in 19th Century British Fiction" was classified under English Literature, but a title such as "Women

as Rebels: a Literary View," was classified as Women's Studies. While the results of recoding the entire NLS/PETS course file increased the instances under the Women's Studies code by 40%, and while our faculty reviewers agreed with the tenor of the decision rule, the total may still be understated.

The cluster covering "non-western culture and society" is the only cluster with a significant representation of foreign language courses. The study of foreign languages, particularly at the elementary and intermediate levels, does not necessarily provide cultural information. Where it does, in the case of European languages, the information is not significantly different from that which students acquire in history, geography, and literature-in-translation courses. In fact, the level of information is more likely to be that of a high school history or geography course. But among the less-commonly-taught languages, the non-European languages represent significant border-crossings for students, and inherently open new doors of perception. They do so principally by utilizing systems of representation other than a Romanized alphabet (to be sure, so do both Russian and Greek). Even in elementary and intermediate level courses in Chinese, for example, the very construction of a character in the written language has historical and cultural determinants that are very likely to be taught. Hence, such courses are included in a cultural literacy cluster.

Lambert's more limited and focused study of the "international studies" content in the transcripts of 8,400 students who graduated from four community colleges and thirty four-year colleges in 1986 (Lambert, 1989) includes not only all foreign languages, but also all study abroad, whether in western or non-western nations. In our very different sample, over 3,200 institutions were represented, and it appeared to me that no two of them flagged study abroad courses or semesters the same way. Hence, our coding system does not account for any distinction between what courses were taken in the U.S. and what courses were taken elsewhere. A course in Art History taken at the University of Bologna will be coded as Art History if the credits were accepted and entered on the transcript of the student's home institution. That the course was taught in Italian will not be known. None of my cultural literacy categories accounts for this type of phenomenon, and that shortcoming derives from the limitations of the database. Nonetheless, in a national sample covering students who did not graduate from either a community college or four-year college (as well as those who did), I don't believe the incidence of "study abroad" would be very notable.

The cluster of courses comprising "popular culture/media" does not include occupational or vocationally-oriented titles such as television production, cinematography, commercial photography and

so forth. While our taxonomy includes categories for these topics, a search of a sample of college and community college catalogues convinced me that most of what is covered in such courses is technique, not cultural content. A course entitled "The History of Television" or "Film Theory and Criticism," however, is far more likely to focus on cultural interests and to include vocabulary and references that are used in ordinary discourse and general reading.

There are actually two "western culture and society" clusters. The first consists of basic courses such as "Western Civ" or "World Literature" (see Table), and I comment more about that cluster below. The second, which is our principal interest, covers courses beyond the basics. This cluster may understate the full measure of immersion in western cultural information because of ambiguities that remain in the taxonomy of courses in the areas of religion and theology. The Classification of Instructional Programs that we modified for this project presents two distinct categories, Religion and Theology. The former was conceived as covering the secular study of religion in the context of the liberal arts, even if that study took place in a denominational college or university. The latter existed in the CIP taxonomy to cover the study of specific religious doctrine, practices, etc. for those training to become ministers, rabbis, and priests, and with the assumption that this study would occur principally in seminaries.

This guiding distinction did not always work in the assignment of course titles. There is no question that specialized institutions (read "seminaries") accounted for an inordinate percentage of cases under the various Theology course codes, and far less under the Religion codes. For that reason, in part, I did not include any of the Theology titles except "Bible Studies" in the Western Culture and Society cluster.

As for Religion, the version of the CIP taxonomy that guided the original coding of the NLS/PETS had one and only one code for the whole field. I subsequently disaggregated the field, sorting the roughly 2000 titles into seven (7) categories, of which only three--Non-Western Religions, Christianity, and Judaism--could be assigned unambiguously to a cultural literacy cluster. Courses in the other categories may have drawn exclusively on western religious traditions, but one could not determine that from the titles.

I do not pretend that these four clusters cover the entire range of cultural literacies. Nor do I pretend to know precisely what was taught in the courses comprising these clusters and how it was taught, and whether it is taught in ways that encouraged active learning and engagement. And I do not pretend to know, in

fact, whether the students were demonstrably literate as a result. But we can make more reasonable assumptions about the content and process of immersion in intermediate and advanced-level elective courses than we can about broad surveys and required introductions to the disciplines: the water is deeper, and the opportunity to transform information to knowledge greater. Hence I have selected the data principally from realms beyond the basic.

Basic Enrollments: Clusters and Courses

The best place to start our walk through the data--and that which always holds the greatest interest--is with the basic list of courses in each of the four "cultural literacy" clusters, indicating the numbers--and more critically, the weighted percentages--of students who took those courses (see Table 1).

The reader will note that I include in the definition of these clusters courses from disciplines outside the humanities, narrowly construed, indeed, from disciplines with very different knowledge paradigms from those of philosophy or literature. These disciplines--anthropology, history, music, fine arts, political science, geography--all draw on primary materials presented in forms other than book-texts: archival records, photographs, recordings, computerized data, letters, lithographs, newspapers, costumes, artifacts of agriculture and industry, the man-made environment (houses, roads, cities, etc.), notebooks, and so forth. All the phenomena represented by these materials have labels in any human language. And if we cannot use the labels, no one knows what we're talking about or writing about or singing about. Hirsch recognizes that point, even if many of his critics--and supporters--are reluctant to concede it.

Before we examine the clusters more carefully, however, it is extremely important to note that the majority of students' academic time is spent acquiring information and skills that are either generic, psychomotor or devoid of any prima facie cultural and social information, and/or that are designed to produce occupational competence. The sheer amount of time the generation of the NLS/72 spent studying accounting, marketing, physical education, nursing, and basic electrical circuits, for example, absolutely dwarfs the amount of time it spent in the formal streams of explicitly cultural/social information. The languages learned by such curricular experience connect these students more to economic activity, narrowly construed, than to the contexts of economic activity, broadly construed.

With few exceptions, few people in the NLS/72 cohort took courses in any of these clusters except Western Culture and Society, and even there, the percentages are small compared to those courses

that seem to define the "core curriculum" for this generation, to wit, and for Bachelor's degree holders only:

English Comp: Regular:	71.9% of students	3.0% of credits
General Psychology:	68.4	1.9
Introduction to Sociology:	48.6	1.3
General Biology:	46.1	2.0
Introduction to Economics:	43.2	1.6
Intro. to Communications:	35.0	0.9
*U.S. Government	34.8	1.1
General Chemistry:	34.5	1.9
*Intro. to Literature: Gen	30.5	1.0
Calculus:	29.8	2.0
*Western/World Civ.	28.7	1.5
General Physics	25.7	1.5
Developmental Psychology	25.5	0.8
Statistics (Math)	22.8	0.8
*Intro. to Philosophy	22.3	0.5
*U.S. History Surveys	22.3	0.8
Introduction to Accounting:	22.2	1.0

*These courses are not included in the Western Culture and Society Cluster: see explanation below.

What strikes one about this list is that it is dominated by introductions to those social science/humanities disciplines that are not normally taught in secondary school, i.e. psychology, sociology, economics, philosophy, communications, along with mathematics courses that, if offered in secondary schools, do not usually meet college-level standards of content.

In addition, unlike the lists for the cultural literacy clusters, many of the courses on the above list are required, and virtually all are prerequisites to something else. No wonder the percentage of students taking them is rather high; no wonder they account for nearly one-quarter of the total undergraduate time (using credits as proxies for time) of those who earned Bachelor's degrees.

But if roughly one out of five Bachelor's degree holders has studied accounting, while one out of 20 has studied European history since 1789, one out of 50 has been exposed to any topic dealing with native Americans, and one out of 100 has studied jazz history or Afro-American music, then no matter how we define cultural information, no matter what store of language to which we refer, its diffusion was limited. Based on the records of their coursework alone, college graduates of this cohort are far more likely to use the term, "leveraged buy-out" in a conversation (even as a metaphor) than "Waterloo," "shaman," or "riff."

To be sure, there are courses on the above list that provide students with considerable exposure to major concepts, texts, and chronicles of U.S. and European origin. But these courses--Western Civ, U.S. Government, U.S. History surveys, Introduction to Literature, etc.--all cover territory previously traversed in secondary schools and usually required for high school graduation. The college-level versions of these topics may be more sophisticated, may encompass more material, or may be simply different in their approach. One must acknowledge that, in these respects, they reinforce the store of language and references to which students had been exposed, but we cannot assume that they either measurably expand that store or turn information into knowledge. The course categories in what I call the "Western Culture and Society" cluster, however, are far more likely to be college-level expansions of the stock.

Philosophy is a different case. Assuming that an "introduction to philosophy" course emphasizes the logical apparatus of the discipline, it may enhance cultural literacy by enabling students to build knowledge out of information, to take what Hirsch unfortunately calls a "hazy" collection of touchstone terms and turn them into active and clear frameworks for understanding. To be sure, philosophers develop analytic and deductive thinking muscles by addressing specific kinds of questions, such as whether it is better to suffer wrong or do wrong, how we judge what is beautiful, or whether words reflect or create reality. In the process of these exercises, philosophy professors may introduce students to the ways in which seminal thinkers or different cultures have dealt with these questions. But there is no guarantee that they will do so in an introductory course, as opposed to, for example, an upper division course in, let us say, Phenomenology.

Basic Enrollments: Institutional Factors

The second characteristic of the diffusion of cultural literacies involves the nature of the institutions in which formal studies are pursued. The issue has intrinsic value, but has been made particularly visible by virulent and largely ignorant debates in the press over what Stanford freshmen are required to read. When one looks at the archive left by an entire generation, it should be rather obvious than Stanford is not where America goes to college, and that whether Stanford freshmen read Cicero or Franz Fanon is a matter worthy of a raree show.

The question may be phrased in one of two ways: (1) what types of institutions are the <u>principal providers</u> of different cultural literacies to the general college going population? (2) in what types of institutions are students more likely to elect studies that will immerse them in these literacies? Both versions of the

question require us to refer to the ratios illustrated in Table 2. Referring to undergraduate course-taking only, what I've done in Table 2 is to set the enrollment share of each institutional type for any one course category against the enrollment share of each institutional type for all course categories. Where the difference between the two shares is greater than 25% (a figure derived from the standard deviation for all courses taken in comprehensive colleges, that is, the institutional type carrying a plurality of the enrollments), that means that the institutional type is providing and/or students in that institutional type are choosing to study the cultural content/information of the course category at a significantly higher rate than the norm.

Thus, for example, we could say that comprehensive colleges were the principal providers of cultural information to this generation of college students concerning Native Americans and Hispanic Americans, as well as Afro-American history. That is, they provided most of the stock of cultural information based on demographic sub-group interests. On the other hand, doctoral degree-granting institutions were the principal providers of information in matters of non-western culture and society, as illustrated by course categories in Latin American Studies, Non-Western Government and Politics, Economic Development, and Non-Western Art. These are academic specialist interests, and are most easily realized in complex institutions that support a greater range of academic specialties than do other institutions. Too, academic expertise is more an objective of specialist interests than it is of demographic or cultural interests, and the ideal of academic expertise is more firmly entrenched in doctoral institutions than elsewhere.

While Liberal Arts colleges are not principal providers of information to an entire generation, students in those colleges were obviously choosing exposure to both non-western and western cultural/social content at rates double the norm for liberal arts colleges in such course categories as non-western literature in English, African history, non-western Art, classical literature, and contemporary philosophy.

It is not surprising to find that community colleges are not principal providers of cultural information to a generation of college students, a most of the courses in our four clusters are upper division offerings. But even in the Basic Western Culture and Society Cluster, the only course category in which the community college dominates is "U.S. History: Surveys" (34.5% of all completed courses).

To be sure, these patterns reflect the curricular capacities and missions of the institutions in question. Comprehensive

colleges provided the mass of degrees in teacher education for this generation, and given the preparation of teachers for work in urban schools, it is not surprising that a significant percentage of those who earned credits in minority and women's studies were teacher education majors. In terms of institutional capacity, liberal arts colleges simply do not offer as full a range of curricula in communications/popular culture as do larger institutions. And community colleges are busy providing occupationally-oriented programs to two-thirds of their degree candidates. All these features of institutional type are reflected in course-taking data.

The Demography of Enrollments

The third set of observations concerns the demography of enrollments, that is, who tends to engage in formal study in one or more of these cultural literacies clusters. The stock variables of "who" fall in two classes: demographic background (race, sex, SES) and educational attainment (e.g. high school class rank, highest degree, college grade point average, etc.).

With one exception, there is very little variation in coursetaking across these clusters by gender. As Table 3A demonstrates, among Bachelors' degree holders, a much high percentage of women (23.4%) than men (12.7%) take at least one course in minority and women's studies, but those percentages are still rather low. This obvious gender-related curricular choice is not found in any of the other cultural literacy clusters.

On the other hand, if we focus on individual course categories rather than clusters, there are considerable variations by population sub-groups. Women comprise 80% of the enrollment in Women's Studies courses; Blacks comprise 60% of the enrollment in Afro-American history, 65% in Afro-American literature, 80% in African languages and 39% in African Studies; Hispanics account for nearly 20% of the enrollment in Latin American history. All these cases represent incredibly disproportionate concentrations of these sub-groups in relation to their overall presence in the cohort. Demography is curricular destiny.

The socioeconomic status of students who take courses in these clusters also departs significantly from the distributions found among the entire cohort. In general, the higher the higher. That is, a higher percentage of students taking these course clusters comes from the top 25% of the SES range than is the case for the entire cohort who entered college. This relationship holds across all racial sub-groups. The one exception occurs in the Non-Western Culture and Society cluster, in which low SES students were more likely to take courses in African and Latin American studies. Exposure to the stock of information in the

Non-Western Culture and Society cluster, then, seems to be determined somewhat by demographic interest as well as specialist interest.

The relationship between SES and course-taking in these clusters is understandable. Remember that most of the courses in these clusters are not introductory titles, hence have prerequisites and are taken more by those who have persisted to upper division status; and people from higher SES brackets are more likely to persist and complete Bachelor's degrees than others.

Thus, it should also surprise no one that the percentage of students who take these courses and eventually receive Bachelor's degrees is much, much higher than for the entire cohort, again, a relationship that holds for all racial sub-groups. For example, over a 12 year period, 43% of all who entered higher education (two or four-year colleges) at any time received the Bachelor's degree; and 30% of the Blacks who entered received the degree. In contrast, among those studying in our four clusters, we find the following proportions of Bachelor's degree attainment:

	All	Blacks
Minority/Women's Studies	70.7%	54.1%
Popular Culture	73.1	57.4
Non-Western Culture/Society	74.3	58.5
Western Culture/Society	64.2	53.0

These data are reinforced by Tables 3A, 4A, 5A, and 6A, all of which indicate a bimodal pattern of participation in the curricula of all four cultural literacies between those who earned the Bachelor's (or higher) degree, and those who did not.

The acquisition of cultural information of any kind relies heavily (though not exclusively) on language skills. While 20% of the Bachelor's degree holders (and 24% of those who did not earn the B.A.) took one or more remedial English courses (indicating deficiencies in language skills on entrance to college), these people participated in the four clusters at the same rates as those who did not require remediation.

Enrollments and Major

Undergraduate major is a natural determinant of participation in the various stocks of cultural literacy. Tables 3B, 4B, 5B, and 6B illustrate this phenomenon. Again, demographic sub-group interests, cultural interests, and specialist interests all play a role in interpretation of the data.

Consider, for example, participation in minority and women's studies courses (Table 3B), which is greatest for majors in Education, Humanities, Social Sciences, and Applied Services (a category that includes Social Work, Criminal Justice, Home Economics, Library Science, Recreation, and Communications). Conventional wisdom concerning the majors of women and Blacks i.e. the demographic sub-groups, is borne out by the data: with minor exceptions (social sciences for women, humanities for non-Asian minorities), students meeting those basic demographic characteristics major disproportionally in those four areas:

	% of Majors who are:		% of	% of	% of
	Women	Black	Women	Blacks	All
Education	72.4%	7.4%	25.4%	21.8%	16.5%
Humanities	64.1	4.5	8.2	4.9	6.0
Social Sci.	41.1	7.2	15.2	22.5	17.4
Applied Serv	58.1	7.0	11.6	11.7	9.6
All	47.0%	5.6%	----	----	----

Participation in courses in the "popular culture" cluster is also driven by undergraduate major, but for different reasons. Students majoring in disciplines that rely on cultural artifacts as primary materials are more likely to enter this stream of information than others. One would expect a higher degree of participation by majors in the humanities, arts, and social sciences, and, indeed, one finds it (see Table 4B). But the highest degree of participation is among majors in Applied Services. Why? Because Communications, as a major, is included in that category, more than a third of Communications majors take more than one course in the cluster, usually studies in film.

As for the non-western culture and society cluster, we again have the specialist-interest phenomenon. It is very hard to major in Geography, Anthropology, or International Relations, for example, and not encounter at least a portion of the non-western stock of cultural and social references. It is not surprising, then, that the highest participation in this cluster is that of majors in the Social Sciences.

Western Culture and Society as a Primary Store

Finally, to what extent was this cohort immersed in the stream of information, references, etc. explicitly derived from western culture and society, a stream flowing through the fields of literature, geography, music, government, philosophy?

One out of every five Bachelor's degree recipients--as well as over half of those who earned less than the Bachelor's degree--in

the NLS/72 had no postsecondary exposure to western cultural/social information at all. The lowest participation rates occurred among majors in Engineering and Applied Sciences (a category including Architecture, Agriculture, Allied Health, Nursing, and Engineering Technologies).

Beyond these two observations, there are no clear-cut patterns, either by demographic sub-group or category of educational attainment. For example, among those who earned Bachelor's degrees. and in the basic course cluster for western culture/society (see Table 7), minority students evidence a higher exposure than whites (65% of the Blacks and 61% of Hispanics took more than 4 credits, versus 51% of whites). In the cluster of courses beyond the basics, however, the differences among the racial groups were statistically insignificant.

Immersion in the streams of language that yield Hirsch's primary cultural literacy was more frequent than immersion in the streams of secondary cultural literacies. But there is no question that the waters ran neither wide nor deep through the generation that is now "thirtysomething."

Indeed, that generation may not consist of efficient participants in its own culture and economy. Given its even more limited exposure to secondary cultural literacies, it certainly seems unsuited to participate in the diversity of world culture and economy. In light of the data and its governing notion that the diffusion of knowledge best takes place when the water is deep, the arguments among humanities faculty about canons and contents seem so often misdirected, as they focus on--at best--a quarter of the students who pass through our institutions of higher education, the only students who make--or are required to make--any effort at all to expand their language space.

REFERENCES

Adelman, C. Generations. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1972.

Becher, A. Academic Tribes and Territories. Philadelphia: Open University Press, 1989.

Booth, W. C. "Cultural Literacy and Liberal Learning: an Open Letter to E. D. Hirsch, Jr." Change, vol. 20, no. 4 (July/August, 1989) pp. 10-21.

Burns, M. "How Should History Be Taught?" The New York Times. Nov. 22. 1986, p. 21.

Crane, D. Invisible Colleges. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1972.

Dupree. A. H. "The National Pattern of American Learned Societies, 1769-1863." In Oleson, A. and Brown, S. C. The Pursuit of Knowledge in the Early American Republic. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, 1976, pp. 21-32.

Fishman, J.A. "The Impact of Nationalism on Language Planning." In Rubin, J. and Jernudd, B.H., Can Language Be Planned? Honululu: Univ. Press of Hawaii, 1971, pp. 3-20.

Ferguson, C.A. "Language Development." In Fishman, J.A., Ferguson, C.A., and Das Gupta, J., Language Problems of Developing Nations. New York: Wiley & Co., 1968.

Hirsch, E. D., Jr. "Cultural Literacy." The American Scholar, vol. (1983), pp. 159-169.

Hirsch, E.D., Jr. Cultural Literacy: What Every American Needs to Know. New York: Random House, 1988.

Hirsch, E.D., Jr. "Comments on Profession 88." In Profession, 1988. New York: Modern Language Association of America, 1988, pp. 77-80.

Hirsch, E.D., Jr. "A Postscript." , Change, vol. 20, no. 4 (July/August, 1989), pp. 23-26.

Holton G. "Scientific Research and Scholarship," Daedalus, vol. 91 (1962), pp. 362-99.

Kohl, H. "The Primal Scene of Education: an Exchange." New York Review of Books, vol. 36, no. 6 (April 13, 1989), p. 50.

Kuhn, T. The Structure of Scientific Revolutions. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960.

Lambert, R. D. International Studies and the Undergraduate. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1989.

Machlup, F. Knowledge: Its Creation, Distribution, and Economic Significance. 2 vols. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980.

Mueller, M. "Yellow Stripes and Dead Armadillos." In Profession, 1989. New York: Modern Language Association of America, 1989, pp. 23-31.

Ross, E. W. "Social Studies and the Ruse of Cultural Literacy." Social Science Record, vol. 26, no. 2 (1989), pp. 13-15.

Scholes, R. "Three Views of Education: Nostalgia, History, and Voodoo." College English, vol. 50 (1988), pp. 323-332.

Sledd, A. and Sledd, J. "Hirsch's Use of His Sources in Cultural Literacy: a Critique." In Profession, 1988. New York: Modern Language Association of America, 1988, pp. 33-39.

Todorov, T. "Crimes Against Humanities." The New Republic. Vol. 201, no. 1 (July 3, 1989), pp. 26-30.

KEY: BACHELOR'S DEGREE MAJOR GROUPINGS

Category and Coverage	N	Weighted
1. Business Business Admin, Accounting, Marketing,etc.	789	16.2%
2. Education	858	16.6
3. Engineering and Computer Science	241	4.9
4. Physical Sci and Math Chemistry, Physics, Geology, Astronomy, Math, Statistics, etc.	192	4.2
5. Humanities English, Foreign Languages, Philosophy	294	6.1
6. Arts Drama, Music, Fine Arts, Film Arts	221	4.5
7. Social Sciences Area Studies, Ethnic Studies, Psychology, Anthropology, Geography, History, Economics, Political Science, Sociology, etc.	863	17.5
8. Biological Sciences	312	6.4
9. Health Sciences & Services Allied Health, Speech Pathology/Audiology, Nursing, Clinical Health Sciences, Pre-Med, Pharmacy, Public Health	362	7.6
10.Applied Fields: Science Based Agriculture, Architecture, Science Technologies	169	3.3
11.Applied Fields: Social-Science Based Communications, Home Economics, Protective Services, Social Work, Public Admin	396	8.0
12.Vocational Fields: Technical Communications Technologies, Engineering Technologies, Graphic Communications	59	1.4
13.Vocational Fields: Service Business/Admin Services, Vocational Home Economics, Library Science, Recreation	63	1.2
14.Other Military Science, Interdisciplinary, Theology	98	2.2

NUMBER OF STUDENTS COMPLETING UNDERGRADUATE COURSES: CULTURAL LITERACY CLUSTERS

	All Students* (N=10,718)		Bachelor's Degree (N=4,915)	
	N	Wtgt. N	N	Wtgt. N
CLUSTER #1: MWS				
Afro-Am/Black Studies	306	2.3%	181	3.1%
Native American Studies	180	1.7	129	2.8
Hispanic Amer. Studies	132	1.0	72	1.3
Asian-American Studies	14	0.1	9	0.1
Other Ethnic Studies	91	0.8	72	1.3
Bilingual/Bicult. Educ.	34	0.3	24	0.5
Native American Langs.	5	0.1	4	0.1
Afro-Amer. Literature	115	0.9	68	1.2
Afro-Amer. History	181	1.4	103	2.0
Sociol. of Minorities	361	3.1	262	5.1
Afro-Amer. Music	34	0.2	26	0.4
Women's Studies	350	3.5	278	6.0
CLUSTER #2: POP				
Science Fict/Fantasy	111	1.1%	75	1.7%
Folklore	116	1.1	97	2.1
Film & Literature	60	0.6	46	1.0
Popular Culture	53	0.5	39	0.8
Future Studies	49	0.4	38	0.7
Leisure/Sports Studies	109	1.1	89	2.0
Film Studies	309	3.0	222	4.9
Film History/Criticsm	199	1.9	156	3.2
Music Hist.: Jazz	124	1.2	86	1.8
Music Hist.: Pop, Rock	61	0.6	39	0.8
History of Dance	16	0.2	13	0.3
Mass Communications	428	4.1	306	6.4
CLUSTER #3: NWCS				
African Studies	85	0.7%	56	1.1%
Asian Studies: Gen.	63	0.6	49	0.9
East Asian Studies	71	0.7	58	1.2
Latin American Studies	117	1.1	87	1.7
Middle East Studies	52	0.5	42	0.8
Pacific Area Studies	13	0.2	10	0.3
South Asian Studies	16	0.1	12	0.3

*Students who earned more than 10 credits over a 12-year period.

Southeast Asian Studies	15	0.1	7	0.2
African Languages	14	0.1	7	0.1
Chinese: Elem/Intermed.	35	0.3	27	0.5
Chinese: Advanced	5	<0.1	4	0.1
Japanese: Elem/Intermed.	33	0.2	22	0.3
Japanese: Advanced	5	0.1	3	0.1
Other East Asian Langs.	4	<0.1	3	<0.1
Arabic: Elem/Intermed.	9	0.1	8	0.2
Arabic: Advanced	3	<0.1	2	<0.1
Comp. Lit: Non-Western	75	0.6	59	1.1
Non-Western Philosophy	55	0.5	44	0.9
Non-Western Religions	113	1.1	94	2.1
Non-West. Peoples (Anth.)	36	0.3	28	0.5
Nat. Amer. (N&S) Peoples	71	0.7	51	1.0
Economic Development	49	0.5	42	0.9
Geog. of Afr./Nr.East	26	0.2	20	0.4
Geog. of Asia/Pacific	23	0.2	14	0.3
Geog. of Latin Am./Carr.	32	0.3	27	0.5
Asian History	170	1.7	135	2.9
African History	74	0.6	52	1.0
Latin American History	132	1.2	100	2.0
Hist. Oth. World Regions	103	0.9	82	1.6
Non-West Gov't & Pol	115	1.0	96	1.8
Third World Sociology	39	0.4	29	0.6
Non-Western Art	71	0.7	53	1.1
Non-Western Music	19	0.2	15	0.3
CLUSTER #4: AWCS				
Eastern European Stud.	5	0.1%	5	0.1%
European Studies: Gen.	78	0.8	61	1.3
Russian Studies	60	0.5	51	1.0
Scandanavian Studies	11	0.2	10	0.3
Western European Stud.	16	0.1	13	0.2
Canadian Studies	15	0.2	14	0.4
Classical Literature	337	3.5	276	6.4
Bible as Literature	97	0.9	71	1.5
Bible Studies (Theology)	906	7.9	610	11.7
Comp. Lit.: Western	319	3.0	266	5.7
American Literature	1523	14.0	1140	23.1
English Literature	1167	10.0	892	16.6
Shakespeare	410	3.9	343	7.1
Literary History/Crit.	101	1.1	88	2.0
Sci, Tech. & Society	264	2.5	199	4.2
Hist. of Phil.:General	101	0.9	76	1.6
Hist. of Phil.:Ancient	112	1.1	85	1.8
Hist. of Phil.:Modern	86	0.8	68	1.5
Contemporary Philosophy	121	1.2	98	2.1
Religion: Christianity	234	2.1	171	3.3
Religion: Judaism	48	0.5	39	0.9

Hist. of Psychology	112	1.0	92	1.7
Hist. of Econ. Thought	50	0.5	41	0.9
Geog. of NA/Anglo-Amer	234	2.2	187	3.9
Geog. of Europe,USSR	39	0.3	31	0.6
Intell/Cult Hist: Euro	154	1.5	118	2.5
Economic/Business Hist.	151	1.5	119	2.7
Hist of Science/Tech	143	1.3	121	2.4
US Hist to 1860	1649	14.3	1078	20.3
US Hist since 1860	1701	15.3	1117	21.9
US Intell/Cult Hist	173	1.6	141	2.8
Euro Hist: to Rennais.	172	1.5	137	2.7
Euro Hist: Renn - 1789	310	2.8	261	5.2
Euro Hist since 1789	396	3.7	309	6.2
Euro Hist: Ind. Countr.	286	2.8	241	5.2
Euro Hist: Other	238	2.3	187	4.0
US Constit. Law/Hist	370	3.4	271	5.5
European Gov't & Pol	112	1.1	96	2.1
Polit. Behav.,Parties	205	1.9	164	3.4
US Foreign Pol/Diplom.	168	1.6	144	3.0
Hist of Drama/Theatre	544	5.1	374	7.5
Art History: Gen.	1706	15.6	1090	22.1
Hist. of Architecture	93	0.9	68	1.4
Music Hist: Classical	134	1.3	107	2.3
Music Hist: Opera/Mus Th	22	0.2	19	0.4
Classical Greek	61	0.6	49	1.0
Classical Latin	84	0.8	66	1.3

TABLE 2

COURSETAKING BY INSTITUTIONAL TYPE:
Selected Cases by "Cultural Literacy" Cluster

NOTE: Percentages in bold indicate cases in which the share of enrollments exceeds the mean for that institutional type by 25% or more.

	Doct.	Compre	LibArt	CommC.	Oth
[All Courses]	[29.5%]	[36.1%]	[6.1%]	[22.0%]	[6.2%]
Minority/Women's Studies					
Black Studies	37.9%	42.1%	7.6%	11.0%	1.4%
Native Amer. Studies	34.3	46.7	5.0	13.6	0.4
Hispan Amer. Studies	22.5	47.6	1.5	26.9	1.5
Afro-Amer Literature	24.7	43.8	10.3	17.1	4.1
Afro-Amer History	21.4	45.1	7.0	24.9	1.6
Women's Studies	35.9	42.3	6.2	14.7	1.0
Popular Culture					
Science Fiction	30.2%	45.0%	2.3%	19.4%	3.1%
Leisure/Spts Studies	44.4	44.4	4.2	6.9	---
Film History/Crit.	39.5	43.0	7.4	7.4	2.7
Music Hist.:Pop/Rock	26.0	38.4	8.2	24.7	2.7
Mass Communications	43.0	42.5	2.6	9.2	2.7
Non-Western Cult/Soc					
Latin Amer. Studies	45.3%	34.3%	7.7%	11.6%	1.1%
Chinese: Elem/Interm	49.5	26.3	9.5	2.1	12.6
Japanese: Elem/Interm	62.3	13.2	7.6	17.0	---
Comp Lit: Non-Western	27.7	40.4	17.0	12.8	2.1
Economic Deveopment	50.8	29.5	13.1	3.3	3.3
African History	36.7	36.7	14.3	11.2	1.0
Non-Western Gov't	58.8	32.4	5.9	0.6	2.4
Non-Western Art	40.6	19.8	19.8	12.9	6.9
Non-Western Religion	36.5	38.9	19.1	4.8	0.8
Western Cult/Soc					
Russian Studies	55.0%	26.4%	8.8%	8.8%	1.1%
Classical Literature	47.1	36.3	12.9	3.7	---
Shakespeare	42.0	38.1	10.9	8.4	0.5
Contemporary Philos	36.1	42.2	16.9	3.6	1.2
Geog of Anglo-America	35.5	48.8	2.3	13.0	0.3
US Intell/Cult Hist.	42.5	35.5	13.2	4.8	4.0
European Gov't & Pol	43.2	45.9	9.6	0.7	0.7
Music Hist.: Classical	40.0	36.8	15.5	2.3	5.5
Bible Studies	8.0	30.3	25.5	7.0	29.2

TABLE 3A

PERCENT OF STUDENTS EARNING CREDITS IN MINORITY AND WOMEN'S STUDIES: by Race and Degree Level, Sex and SES (weighted, standard errors in parens)

# Credits:	0		1-4		5-8		9+	
Less than B.A.								
All	95.1%	(.128)	3.6%	(.102)	0.8%	(.036)	0.6%	(.047)
White	96.8	(.117)	2.6	(.086)	0.4	(.026)	0.2	(.050)
Black	85.2	(.486)	9.0	(.505)	3.2	(.234)	2.6	(.190)
Hispanic	86.3	(.425)	9.6	(.453)	2.3	(.164)	1.8	(.105)
Men	96.2	(.126)	2.8	(.106)	0.6	(.060)	0.4	(.010)
Women	93.9	(.203)	4.4	(.175)	1.0	(.039)	0.8	(.091)
High SES	93.3	(.295)	4.4	(.297)	1.6	(.067)	0.7	(.029)
Mod SES	96.1	(.174)	3.0	(.129)	0.5	(.061)	0.5	(.058)
Low SES	94.6	(.215)	4.1	(.147)	0.7	(.031)	0.6	(.134)
B.A. or Higher								
All	82.3	(.222)	12.7	(.209)	2.9	(.104)	2.1	(.096)
White	84.5	(.212)	12.1	(.209)	2.4	(.107)	1.0	(.073)
Black	50.7	(1.05)	22.2	(1.14)	11.1	(.604)	16.0	(.637)
Hispanic	63.6	(2.42)	17.7	(1.79)	2.1	(.110)	16.7	(1.89)
Men	87.3	(.320)	9.6	(.285)	1.9	(.106)	1.2	(.156)
Women	76.6	(.297)	16.3	(.289)	4.1	(.182)	3.1	(.112)
High SES	76.3	(.730)	13.2	(.640)	4.6	(.382)	5.8	(.238)
Mod SES	82.2	(.481)	13.5	(.432)	2.5	(.112)	1.8	(.116)
Low SES	83.4	(.261)	12.1	(.246)	2.9	(.163)	1.6	(.133)

Course categories in this cluster include:

- Black/Afro-American Studies
- Native American Studies
- Hispanic-American Studies
- Asian-American Studies
- Ethnic Studies: Other
- Bi-lingual/Bi-cultural Education
- Native American Langs.
- Afro-American Literature
- Afro-American History
- Sociology of Minor. Groups
- Afro-American Music
- Women's Studies

TABLE 3B

PERCENT of B.A. STUDENTS EARNING CREDITS IN MINORITY AND WOMEN'S STUDIES:
by Institutional Type and B.A. Major
(weighted; standard errors in parens)

# of Credits:	0		1-4		5-8		9+	
Instit. Type								
Doctoral	83.6%	(.317)	11.8%	(.257)	2.4%	(.097)	2.2%	(.136)
Comprehen.	80.2	(.414)	14.0	(.356)	3.6	(.149)	2.3	(.160)
Lib. Arts	82.3	(.790)	13.9	(.767)	2.3	(.225)	1.5	(.229)
Other	93.6	(.1.19)	4.7	(.968)	1.4	(.720)	0.4	(.212)
BA Major								
Business	91.3	(.475)	6.8	(.498)	1.5	(.169)	0.4	(.005)
Education	84.8	(.349)	12.1	(.348)	1.8	(.071)	1.4	(.209)
Engineer.	98.5	(.278)	1.1	(.024)	0.4	(.279)	---	------
PhysSci	89.2	(.483)	7.6	(.428)	0.9	(.032)	2.3	(.078)
Humanit.	73.7	(.863)	19.3	(.899)	5.4	(.499)	1.7	(.046)
Arts	86.1	(1.47)	8.2	(.903)	5.4	(.757)	0.3	(.011)
SocSci	64.5	(.718)	22.3	(.724)	6.6	(.344)	6.7	(.345)
BioSci	89.3	(.719)	8.5	(.718)	1.6	(.041)	0.7	(.018)
HealthSci	91.3	(.571)	6.5	(.538)	1.8	(.217)	0.4	(.008)
Applied: Sci-Base	90.7	(.267)	9.0	(.257)	---	-----	0.3	(.010)
Appl: Soc Sci-Base	70.2	(.926)	22.1	(.821)	3.8	(.261)	3.9	(.603)
Voc/Tech	89.6	(1.75)	8.0	(1.77)	1.7	(.072)	0.7	(.032)
Voc/Serv	77.1	(3.02)	19.8	(3.06)	---	-----	3.3	(.210)
Other	83.0	(1.52)	15.6	(1.54)	1.4	(.067)	---	-----

TABLE 4A

PERCENT OF STUDENTS EARNING CREDITS IN "POPULAR CULTURE" COURSES by Race and Degree Level, Sex and SES (weighted, standard errors in parens)

# Credits:	0		1-4		5-8		9+	
Less than B.A.								
All	95.3%	(.117)	4.0%	(.097)	0.5%	(.050)	0.2%	(.020)
White	95.1	(.145)	4.2	(.123)	0.5	(.060)	0.1	(.024)
Black	96.4	(.270)	3.2	(.270)	0.3	(.006)	0.2	(.003)
Hispanic	96.9	(.072)	2.8	(.065)	0.3	(.006)	---	-----
Men	94.8	(.154)	4.4	(.148)	0.7	(.062)	0.1	(.028)
Women	95.9	(.129)	3.7	(.103)	0.3	(.060)	0.1	(.028)
Low SES	97.5	(.151)	2.3	(.099)	0.2	(.099)	0.1	(.066)
Mod SES	95.9	(.165)	3.6	(.142)	0.4	(.086)	0.1	(.020)
High SES	92.4	(.259)	6.5	(.249)	1.0	(.053)	0.2	(.037)
B.A. and Above:								
All	81.0	(.214)	14.6	(.224)	3.5	(.093)	0.9	(.051)
White	80.5	(.223)	15.0	(.232)	3.6	(.100)	0.9	(.056)
Black	86.4	(.683)	9.9	(.644)	2.7	(.085)	1.0	(.030)
Hispanic	88.5	(1.26)	8.3	(1.37)	1.7	(.091)	1.5	(.070)
Men	80.1	(.316)	15.5	(.310)	3.3	(.131)	1.1	(.075)
Women	81.9	(.376)	13.6	(.361)	3.8	(.150)	0.7	(.070)
Low SES	86.7	(.486)	10.8	(.409)	1.8	(.259)	0.8	(.016)
Mod SES	81.6	(.334)	14.1	(.330)	3.8	(.141)	1.3	(.089)
High SES	79.3	(.365)	15.7	(.366)	3.7	(.147)	1.3	(.097)

Course categories in this cluster include:

Science Fiction/Fantasy
Folklore (Lit.)
Film and Literature
Popular Culture
Future Studies
Leisure/Sports Studies
Film Studies
Film History/Criticism
Music History: Jazz
Music History: Pop/Rock
History of Dance
Mass Communications

TABLE 4B

PERCENT of B.A. STUDENTS EARNING CREDITS IN "POPULAR CULTURE" COURSES:
by Institutional Type and B.A. Major
(weighted; standard errors in parens)

# of Credits:	0		1-4		5-8		9+	
Instit. Type								
Doctoral	77.7%	(.356)	17.7%	(.368)	3.8%	(.174)	0.9%	(.074)
Comprehen.	81.5	(.385)	13.4	(.383)	3.9	(.117)	1.3	(.089)
Lib. Arts	89.6	(.700)	8.7	(.653)	1.5	(.306)	0.2	(.003)
Other	87.0	(1.80)	11.5	(1.75)	1.5	(.563)	---	-----
BA Major								
Business	86.4	(.494)	11.7	(.461)	1.7	(.186)	0.2	(.003)
Education	84.9	(.543)	12.5	(.492)	2.1	(.027)	0.5	(.238)
Engineer.	91.2	(.199)	8.5	(.192)	0.3	(.008)	---	-----
PhysSci	82.8	(1.51)	15.2	(1.53)	1.9	(.066)	---	-----
Humanit.	73.8	(1.10)	19.8	(1.07)	4.8	(.450)	1.7	(.045)
Arts	77.3	(1.37)	15.9	(1.30)	5.2	(.379)	1.6	(.630)
SocSci	76.5	(.641)	18.4	(.650)	4.5	(.209)	0.6	(.009)
BioSci	87.5	(.813)	11.0	(.633)	1.3	(.542)	0.2	(.005)
HealthSci	90.8	(.950)	8.0	(.956)	1.2	(.025)	---	-----
Applied: Sci-Base	91.8	(.661)	8.2	(.661)	---	-----	---	-----
Appl: Soc Sci-Base	56.7	(.988)	23.2	(.813)	13.8	(.752)	6.4	(.276)
Voc/Tech	75.6	(1.07)	21.3	(.929)	3.1	(.135)	---	-----
Voc/Serv	55.0	(3.13)	37.1	(3.06)	7.2	(.464)	0.6	(.039)
Other	84.3	(1.74)	12.4	(1.37)	2.6	(1.37)	0.7	(.035)

TABLE 5A

PERCENT OF STUDENTS EARNING CREDITS IN NON-WESTERN CULTURE & SOCIETY: by Race and Degree Level, Sex and SES (weighted, standard errors in parens)

# Credits:	0		1-4		5-8		9+	
Less than B.A.								
All	96.0%	(.084)	3.1%	(.083)	0.6%	(.032)	0.3%	(.022)
White	96.7	(.085)	2.5	(.084)	0.5	(.035)	0.3	(.022)
Black	93.6	(.347)	5.4	(.329)	0.7	(.078)	0.4	(.104)
Hispanic	90.1	(.602)	9.0	(.626)	0.8	(.204)	0.1	(.002)
Men	95.9	(.132)	3.2	(.135)	0.5	(.020)	0.3	(.025)
Women	96.2	(.128)	3.0	(.108)	0.6	(.060)	0.2	(.036)
Low SES	96.2	(.183)	3.2	(.178)	0.3	(.034)	0.3	(.003)
Mod SES	96.9	(.120)	2.5	(.113)	0.4	(.017)	0.3	(.035)
High SES	94.2	(.190)	4.2	(.155)	1.2	(.111)	0.4	(.046)
B.A. or Higher								
All	82.2	(.230)	12.0	(.201)	3.1	(.107)	2.7	(.089)
White	83.0	(.242)	11.5	(.206)	3.0	(.115)	2.5	(.093)
Black	74.0	(.839)	14.9	(.568)	5.6	(.420)	5.4	(.168)
Hispanic	64.9	(1.80)	26.3	(1.70)	3.6	(.190)	5.3	(.717)
Men	82.4	(.313)	11.8	(.250)	2.9	(.130)	2.9	(.155)
Women	81.9	(.333)	12.2	(.311)	3.4	(.146)	2.5	(.089)
Low SES	79.9	(.674)	13.4	(.609)	4.0	(.220)	2.7	(.125)
Mod SES	83.8	(.407)	11.4	(.362)	3.0	(.170)	1.8	(.110)
High SES	81.6	(.257)	11.9	(.250)	3.1	(.129)	3.4	(.150)

NOTE: For the list of courses in this cluster, see Table 1.

TABLE 5B

PERCENT of B.A. STUDENTS EARNING CREDITS IN NON-WESTERN CULTURE AND SOCIETY: by Institutional Type and B.A. Major (weighted; standard errors in parens)

# of Credits:	0		1-4		5-8		9+	
Instit. Type								
Doctoral	81.0%	(.309)	12.5%	(.303)	2.9%	(.159)	3.6%	(.160)
Comprehen.	83.5	(.375)	11.3	(.345)	3.3	(.139)	2.0	(.105)
Lib. Arts	77.4	(.682)	15.9	(.688)	3.8	(.207)	2.9	(.060)
Other	90.6	(1.09)	4.6	(.801)	2.9	(.096)	1.9	(.794)
BA Major								
Business	90.0	(.518)	7.9	(.408)	1.3	(.215)	0.8	(.219)
Education	89.3	(.378)	8.9	(.346)	1.2	(.144)	0.6	(.079)
Engineer.	95.3	(.621)	3.7	(.618)	0.8	(.017)	0.2	(.005)
PhysSci	81.8	(1.07)	14.6	(.903)	2.4	(.546)	1.3	(.044)
Humanit.	72.4	(1.18)	17.6	(1.16)	6.5	(.174)	3.6	(.254)
Arts	77.6	(1.58)	16.7	(1.67)	4.9	(.194)	0.8	(.033)
SocSci	59.7	(.617)	21.3	(.593)	8.3	(.539)	10.8	(.361)
BioSci	85.8	(.992)	11.9	(.954)	1.1	(.029)	1.2	(.342)
HealthSci	92.7	(.602)	5.8	(.594)	0.9	(.155)	0.5	(.011)
Applied: Sci-Base	89.4	(.303)	9.8	(.280)	0.8	(.023)	---	-----
Appl: Soc Sci-Base	81.9	(.792)	13.5	(.773)	3.9	(.180)	0.7	(.370)
Voc/Tech	94.1	(.256)	4.9	(.211)	1.0	(.045)	---	-----
Voc/Serv	92.7	(2.30)	4.7	(2.29)	1.4	(.093)	1.2	(.475)
Other	87.0	(1.91)	7.5	(.365)	1.0	(.047)	4.6	(1.74)

TABLE 6A

PERCENT OF STUDENTS EARNING CREDITS IN WESTERN CULTURE AND SOCIETY*
by Race and Degree Level, Sex and SES
(weighted, standard errors in parens)

# Credits:	0		1-4		5-8		9+	
Less than B.A.								
All	70.9%	(.262)	15.3%	(.179)	7.6%	(.128)	6.2%	(.121)
White	69.8	(.281)	15.5	(.189)	8.0	(.146)	6.6	(.145)
Black	77.1	(.722)	13.8	(.572)	5.4	(.294)	3.8	(.265)
Men	69.1	(.323)	16.1	(.246)	8.8	(.196)	6.0	(.129)
Women	72.6	(.354)	14.5	(.230)	6.4	(.147)	6.5	(.182)
Low SES	78.4	(.421)	11.9	(.337)	5.5	(.166)	4.2	(.157)
Mod SES	73.0	(.336)	15.1	(.247)	6.5	(.183)	5.5	(.107)
High SES	60.1	(.452)	18.8	(.341)	11.5	(.307)	9.5	(.304)
B.A. or Higher								
All	20.1	(.244)	23.4	(.250)	19.6	(.198)	36.7	(.311)
White	19.9	(.247)	23.0	(.269)	19.6	(.218)	37.5	(.338)
Black	25.7	(.897)	26.7	(.857)	21.1	(1.20)	26.5	(.877)
Hispanic	17.6	(1.86)	34.9	(2.13)	18.3	(.973)	29.2	(3.32)
Men	21.9	(.357)	24.5	(.316)	20.0	(.275)	33.6	(.321)
Women	18.3	(.348)	22.2	(.402)	19.2	(.312)	40.3	(.526)
Low SES	23.8	(.513)	27.6	(.936)	18.5	(.673)	30.2	(.977)
Mod SES	19.9	(.403)	24.3	(.402)	19.9	(.365)	35.9	(.506)
High SES	19.8	(.288)	21.8	(.383)	19.5	(.369)	39.0	(.447)

*Exclusive of courses in categories of: Western/World Civ., Ancient Civ., US History Survey, Intro to Literature (General, Fiction, Poetry, Drama, Non-Fiction Prose), Modern European Languages, Intro to Philosophy, and philosophy courses on such topics as ethics, logic, epistemology, etc.

TABLE 6B

PERCENT of B.A. STUDENTS EARNING CREDITS IN WESTERN CULTURE AND SOCIETY COURSES: by Institutional Type and B.A. Major (weighted; standard errors in parens)

# of Credits:	0		1-4		5-8		9+	
Instit. Type								
Doctoral	21.6%	(.344)	25.1%	(.508)	19.8%	(.390)	33.5%	(.408)
Comprehen.	20.1	(.403)	24.1	(.355)	19.6	(.352)	36.3	(.522)
Lib. Arts	10.8	(.463)	15.5	(.475)	18.0	(.640)	55.8	(.912)
Other	30.6	(1.49)	17.3	(1.12)	22.4	(1.58)	29.7	(1.46)
BA Major								
Business	23.8	(.684)	28.0	(.588)	23.9	(.694)	24.3	(.723)
Education	17.5	(.427)	25.3	(.573)	23.4	(.541)	33.8	(.602)
Engineer.	43.6	(1.22)	30.8	(1.44)	18.7	(1.17)	6.9	(.832)
PhysSci	26.4	(1.60)	25.6	(1.42)	21.0	(1.67)	27.0	(1.17)
Humanit.	3.9	(.368)	7.2	(.298)	6.9	(1.86)	82.0	(.639)
Arts	6.8	(.905)	12.4	(.905)	16.2	(1.17)	64.7	(1.75)
SocSci	9.1	(.399)	18.4	(.427)	17.1	(.493)	55.5	(.589)
BioSci	26.9	(1.20)	27.9	(1.27)	21.0	(.847)	24.3	(1.09)
HealthSci	35.5	(1.21)	30.0	(1.13)	18.6	(.809)	15.8	(1.20)
Applied: Sci-Base	34.6	(1.41)	30.2	(1.26)	20.2	(.937)	15.0	(.734)
Appl: Soc Sci-Base	16.8	(.677)	24.2	(.797)	20.8	(.723)	38.2	(.788)
Voc/Tech	49.6	(2.19)	21.3	(1.10)	19.5	(2.00)	9.6	(.416)
Voc/Serv	27.1	(2.48)	29.6	(3.09)	18.6	(2.32)	25.3	(3.08)
Other	8.5	(1.34)	12.7	(1.82)	15.9	(.920)	62.9	(2.14)

TABLE 7

PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS EARNING CREDITS IN BASIC WESTERN CULTURE AND SOCIETY COURSES: by Race, Sex, Degree Level, SES

# of Credits:	0	1-4	5-8	9-12	13+	Mean	S.D.	S.E.
Less than BA:								
All	63.9%	18.8%	10.5%	5.2%	1.6%	1.94	3.36	.039
White	63.7	18.8	11.0	5.0	1.5	1.94	3.35	.043
Black	64.5	20.5	7.0	6.2	1.8	1.88	3.35	.104
Hispanic	65.9	16.4	9.7	6.2	2.0	1.99	3.48	.165
Men	62.3	19.1	11.1	6.0	1.6	2.08	3.48	.056
Women	65.6	18.6	9.9	4.4	1.6	1.80	3.24	.054
Low SES	70.3	17.2	7.0	3.5	2.1			
Mod SES	65.1	18.1	10.4	5.0	1.3			
High SES	55.7	21.8	13.8	7.0	1.7			
BA and Above:								
All	23.0	24.8	23.7	19.3	9.2	5.74	5.26	.075
White	23.2	25.6	23.6	18.9	8.8	5.64	5.22	.078
Black	20.3	14.8	23.5	24.3	17.1	7.24	5.83	.294
Hispanic	24.2	15.2	27.6	23.8	9.3	6.10	4.95	.483
Men	22.9	25.4	24.0	18.0	9.7	5.73	5.31	.104
Women	23.1	24.2	23.3	20.7	8.7	5.76	5.20	.108
Low SES	19.9	21.4	26.3	21.1	11.3			
Mod SES	22.9	24.8	23.6	19.1	9.7			
High SES	23.8	25.5	23.1	19.1	8.5			